IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE)
INTEL CORP. MICROPRO	OCESSOR))
ANTITRUST LITIGATION	N ,) MDL Docket No. 05-1717-JJF
ADVANCED MICRO DEV	-	
Delaware corporation, and		
INTERNATIONAL SALE	S & SERVICE LTD,)
a Delaware corporation,,		
	Plaintiffs,)
	riamunis,	Civil Action No. 05-441-JJF
V.	;) CIVII ACUOII 110: 03-441-331
V .	;) }
INTEL CORPORATION, a	n Delaware)
corporation, and INTEL KA	-	
a Japanese corporation,)
,	,)
	Defendants.))
)
	•)
PHIL PAUL, on behalf of l	nimself)
and all others similarly situ	ated,)
	Plaintiffs,)
	•	Civil Action No. 05-485-JJF
v.	,) COMMON TED ACTION
DITTEL CORDON ATION	;) CONSOLIDATED ACTION
INTEL CORPORATION,		<i>}</i> \
	Defendant.	<i>)</i> \
	DOIOHUANT.	j

RESPONSE OF AMD AND CLASS PLAINTIFFS TO UNOPPOSED MOTION OF DEFENDANTS INTEL CORPORATION AND INTEL KUBUSHIKI KAISHA FOR LEAVE TO SERVE A SUBPOENA *DUCES TECUM* ON ATI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

On August 10, 2006, Intel filed an "Unopposed Motion for Leave to Serve A Subpoena Duces Tecum on ATI Technologies." [D.I. 199 (C.A. No. 05-441); 256 (C.A. No. 05-1717)]. AMD and the class plaintiffs respond, not to oppose the motion, but to explain the basis of their non-opposition.

Paragraph 5(g) of Case Management Order #1 [D.I. 123 (C.A. No. 05-441); 79 (C.A. No. 05-1717)] imposed a cut-off of June 15 (later extended to June 22 [D.I. 168 (C.A. No. 05-441); 144 (C.A. No. 05-1717)] for service of certain third-party document subpoenas. Intel assumes that its ATI subpoena falls within the Paragraph 5(g) definition, and therefore seeks to be excused from its operation.

But Paragraph 5(g) only applies to "subpoenas duces tecum to corporate third parties requiring a comprehensive production of their relevant documents." As sweeping as the ATI subpoena may be concerning the subjects it addresses, it is generally confined to documents generated in connection with the AMD-ATI merger, not all documents in ATI's files that may be relevant to this lawsuit. Thus, in the view of AMD and the class plaintiffs, the ATI subpoena does not qualify as one seeking "a comprehensive production of [all of ATI's] relevant documents" and therefore could have been served without leave.

AMD and class plaintiffs do not oppose the ATI subpoena, not because they view all the discovery sought as appropriate, but because of the inapplicability of Paragraph 5(g). Like Intel, they too expect from time-to-time to serve additional corporate third-party subpoenas seeking targeted document discovery concerning specific issues that may arise during the course of the litigation (as opposed to broad-based discovery requiring the third party to make a comprehensive production of all potentially relevant documents). Unless the Court instructs otherwise, they do not intend to seek leave in these situations.

Jesse A. Finkelstein (#1090)

finkelstein@rlf.com

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)

cottrell@rlf.com

Chad M. Shandler (#3796)

shandler@rlf.com

Steven J. Fineman (#4025)

fineman@rlf.com

Richards, Layton & Finger

One Rodney Square

920 North King Street

Wilmington, DE 19801

Chuck Diamond Linda Smith Mark Samuels O'Melveny & Myers LLP 400 South Hope Street Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899

Counsel for Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. and AMD International Sales & Services, Ltd.

Dated: August 11, 2006

/s/ James L. Holzman (#663)

James L. Holzman (#663) jlholzman@prickett.com J. Clayton Athey (#4378) jcathey@prickettt.com Prickett Jones & Elliott, PA 1310 King Street P. O. Box 1328 Wilmington, DE 19899

Interim Liaison Counsel and Attorneys for Phil Paul, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 11, 2006, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF and have sent by Hand Delivery to the following:

Richard L. Horwitz, Esquire W. Harding Drane, Jr., Esquire Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP 1313 North Market Street P. O. Box 951 Wilmington, DE 19899

Robert D. Goldberg, Esquire Biggs and Battaglia 921 North Orange Street Wilmington, DE 19899-1489

and have sent via electronic mail to the following non-registered participants:

Darren B. Bernhard, Esquire Howrey LLP 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20004-2402 Robert E. Cooper, Esquire Daniel S. Floyd, Esquire Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP 333 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, California 90071-3197

Steven J. Fineman (#4025)

Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.

One Rodney Square

P.O. Box 551

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

(302) 651-7700

Fineman@rlf.com